

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1, 5, 7-8, 13, 16-18 and 21-26 have been amended. Claims 27-30 have been cancelled without prejudice. Therefore, claims 1-26 now are presented for examination.

Claim Objections

Claim 5 is objected to because of informalities. Claim 5 is now in proper condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection

Claims 7-8, 16-17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Claims 7, 8, 16-17 and 21 have been amended to overcome the rejection under §112. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 7-8, 16-17 and 21 be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejection

Claims 1, 4, 22 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Iwasaki, U.S. Patent No. 5,274,809 (“Iwasaki”).

Iwasaki discloses “[t]ask execution control for a multiprocessor.” (Abstract). Iwasaki further discloses that the tasks are controlled by a “wait/post mechanism [which] is also called *the suspend/resume, block/activate mechanism [and] sleep/wakeup*

mechanism . . . [and that] [t]he wait procedure . . . [brings] a lock-failing task into a wait state and then invoke[s] the post procedure to restore the task to the ready state.” (col. 2, lines 15-20; emphasis provided).

In contrast, claim 1, in pertinent part, recites “putting a processor that is waiting for the contended lock to become available to sleep until an event occurs.” (emphasis provided). Applicants submit that Iwasaki does not teach or reasonably suggest such a feature. Iwasaki discloses a method for controlling tasks by putting them in a sleep/wakeup mechanism (col. 2, lines 15-17); however, sleep/wakeup of a task is equivalent to locking the task. For example, when a task is sleeping, the task is simply not accessible to anyone that did not invoke the sleep, but the task is still running. In contrast, “putting a processor . . . to sleep until an event occurs” (claim 1; emphasis provided) means that “although the processor may be waiting for the lock to become available, it may sleep while waiting” (Specification paragraph [0017], lines 7-9). Accordingly, Applicants for at least the reasons stated above, respectfully request the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims be withdrawn.

Claim 22 contains limitations similar to those of claims 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 22 its dependent claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 2-3 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwasaki in view of Emer, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,493,741 (“Emer”).

With regard to claims 2-3 and 23-24, they depend from independent claims 1 and 22 respectively, and thus, include the limitations of the independent claim from which

they depend. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-3 and 23-24.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwasaki in view of Venkatasubramanian, U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0236816 (“Venkatasubramanian”).

With regard to claim 5, it depends from independent claim 1 and thus, includes the limitations of the independent claim from which it depends. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5.

Claims 6 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwasaki in view of Panwar, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6, 035,374 (“Panwar”).

With regard to claims 6 and 26, they depend from independent claims 1 and 22 respectively, and thus, include the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6 and 26.

Claims 9-12 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwasaki and Venkatasubramanian, and further in view of Emer.

As discussed above, Iwasaki does not teach or reasonably suggest “putting a processor that is waiting for the contended lock to become available to sleep until an event occurs.” (emphasis provided). Applicants respectfully submit that Iwasaki, Venkatasubramanian and Emer, individually or combined, do not teach or reasonably suggest “putting a processor that is waiting for the contended lock to become available to

sleep until an event occurs.” (emphasis provided). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-12 and 27-30.

Claims 13-14 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwasaki in further in view of Emer.

As discussed above, Iwasaki does not teach or reasonably suggest “putting a processor that is waiting for the contended lock to become available to sleep until an event occurs.” (emphasis provided). Applicants respectfully submit that Iwasaki and Emer, individually or combined, do not teach or reasonably suggest “putting a processor that is waiting for the contended lock to become available to sleep until an event occurs.” (emphasis provided). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13-14 and 18-19.

Claims 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Emer in view of Panwar.

With regard to claims 15 and 20, they depend from independent claims 13 and 18 respectively, and thus, include the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15 and 20.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP



Date: August 18, 2005

Aslam A. Jaffery
Reg. No. 51,841

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980